

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS IN REVIEW: 1997

Editor's Preface

In his preface to *International Legal Developments in Review: 1996*,¹ last year's editor, Professor Robert E. Lutz, described the international legal developments in review project as a "noble experiment." He further explained that the project was conceived with a "three-fold purpose: to provide a snapshot of international legal developments for the year that would be of interest to or have an impact on the international practice of U.S. (public and private) lawyers; to energize the work of the substantive law committees of the Section; and to inspire the production of educational programs addressing selected developments."²

This year the "noble experiment" has continued, but, sadly, it has been only a mixed success. On the positive side, this year's review, like last year's, features some excellent contributions reporting on important developments in a manner that should well fulfill the three-fold purpose of the creators of this project. This year's review contains thirty-five reports representing contributions from more than 112 authors as well as numerous assistants. These contributions did indeed serve "to energize the work of the substantive law committees of the Section."³ In no sense, moreover, can the contributions this year be said to be lacking in quality.

The problem, as a comparison with last year's Review immediately demonstrates, is that the quantity of contributions this year is disappointing. Last year there were forty-six reports in the Review. Even this number, as Professor Lutz noted, did not cover all important areas of legal activity, but the expectation then was that these gaps would be filled in this year's Review. Alas, despite the efforts of many persons—including, in particular, the Division Chairs (David Tang, Don DeAmicis, Rona Mears, and Robert Lutz), their deputies, William Hannay, and yours truly—this was not to be.

This is not the forum in which to discuss the manifold reasons for this drop in quantity. For present purposes it suffices to say that structural problems of current organizational arrangements were a factor, and these will be resolved before next year's Review. The goal of next year should be a 100% contribution from the substantive law committees of the Section.

As editor, I want to express my gratitude to the many contributors who devoted their time and energies to ensuring the quality of this year's Review. I am also grateful to the many persons, especially those identified above, who persistently promoted committee participation in this project. Robert Lutz and Peter Winship were extremely helpful in clarifying many complexities and in answering my numerous questions. Peter Winship and the Student Editorial Board of *The International Lawyer* coordinated the final editing and cite-checking; and Norman Gross ABA Publishing Managing Editor, coordinated the production work in this issue.

Lastly, I am enormously grateful to the secretarial staff of Villanova University School of Law, especially Mrs. Terri LaVerghetta and Mrs. Annette Stalone, for working an unconsciona-

1. 31 INT'L LAW. 231 (1997).

2. *Id.*

3. *Id.*

ble number of hours on this project with grace and good humor. Throughout this project, the faculty support services of the Villanova University School of Law were invaluable.

I would be pleased to receive any comments and suggestions readers of this Review may have. My mailing address is: Professor John F. Murphy, Villanova University School of Law, 299 North Spring Mill Road, Villanova, PA 19085.